
Imprimatur,

July 22. 1686,

J O. BATTELY.

Imprimatur,

July 22. 1686,

J O. BATTELY.

10
8

A N
ANSWER
TO THE
Amicable Accommodation
OF THE
D I F F E R E N C E
BETWEEN THE
REPRESENTER
AND THE
ANSWERER.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *John Amery* at the *Peacock*, and *William Rogers* at
the *Sun*; both against *St. Dunstons Church* in *Fleetstreet*.

MDCLXXXVI.

THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

REPRESENTATIVE

AND THE

LOWDOWN
THE NEW YORK
LIBRARY
REPRESENTATIVE
AND THE
LOWDOWN
THE NEW YORK
LIBRARY
REPRESENTATIVE
AND THE
LOWDOWN

A N
A N S W E R
 TO THE
Amicable ACCOMMODATION,
 Of the Difference between
 The *Representer* and the *Answerer*.

IN Answer to the Reply to *Papists protesting against Protestant Popery*, our Author has *amicably accommodated* away the whole Book, excepting one word called *Misrepresenting*; and therefore whereas he expects Ten sheets from me in return, I must be forced to compound with him for a much less number.

We are likely at last to agree about the meaning of *Misrepresenting*, which is a very common word, and easily understood when men give their minds to it. Our Author Printed a double Character of a *Papist Misrepresented* and *Represented*; the first being an accusation on Protestants for misrepresenting Papists; I examined every part of his Character, and could not find why he called it *Misrepresenting*; for it did not appear by his Characters, that we had charged them with any Doctrines or Practices (excepting some few things) but what they themselves owned. We charge indeed their Doctrines and Practices with such guilt as they do not own; but this told

B

him

him did not properly belong to Representing but Disputing ; for while we agree about matters of fact, there is no Misrepresenting on either side, and then we are no otherwise Misrepresenters, than as all men are who condemn such Opinions and Practices, as others judge very true and innocent; and thus Papists as much misrepresent Protestants, as Protestants misrepresent Papists; that is, they equally differ from each other in their Opinions and judgments of the same things: but who are truly the Misrepresenters, is not to be decided by *Character-making*, but by Reason and Argument.

Amicable Accommodation,
p. 6.

Well, our *Accommodator* is very willing out of civility and for the sake of peace, to yield this point, That *the Title of a Papist Misrepresented, is not to be taken in its strict and proper sence, as Misrepresenting signifies downright Lying, or falsely charging of matter of fact; but in its larger or less proper sence, as it comprehends both Lying, Calumniating, Mis-interpreting, Reproaching, Mis-construing, Mis-judging, &c.* which I confess is a very great piece of civility, that he will not charge us now with *down right lying*, but onely with *Lying* and *Calumniating*, and several other hard words into the bargain.

There needs not many words about this matter, for the short of the case is this: In order to reconcile our people to the Church of Rome, he thought it necessary to perswade them, that Popery is quite another thing, than what they had been taught it is, which would at once remove their prejudices against Popery, and beget in them a great jealousy and suspicion of their former Teachers; for men will not easily trust those who have once deceived them.

In order to this, he gives us a double Character of a Papist; one he calls the *Character of a Papist Misrepresented*, the other of a *Papist Represented*; which any man would
guess,

gues, should be two very different and contrary things ; the first what a Papist is not, the second what he is ; and yet, when we come to examine them, every thing almost, which can properly be called a Character, or Representing, is the same in both ; onely the Character of a Papist Misrepresented tells you, what opinion Protestants have of Popery, and the Character of a Papist Represented, tells us, what good thoughts Papists have of themselves, and their own Religion ; now whoever doubted, but that Papists and Protestants differ very much in their Opinions of Popery, as they do also in their Opinions of Protestancy. And this is the onely pretence for his charge of Misrepresenting, not that we charge them with believing or practising, what they do not believe or practice, but that we think worse of their Faith and Practice than he thinks they deserve.

And if this be all that he means by Misrepresenting, we readily own the charge, that we have much worse thoughts of Popery than he has ; that we believe those Doctrines to be erroneous, and those Practices to be sinful, which he thinks very well of ; and because I am resolved, if possible, to be as civil as he is, in my Concessions, and not to dispute about words, I am contented he should call this misrepresenting, *Lying, Calumniating*, or what he pleases, if he can prove that we condemn their Faith or Worship unjustly ; onely he must remember, that this will engage him in a dispute, which he seems resolved not to engage in. For he must not think, that upon his bare word, we must be concluded guilty of that misrepresenting, which he calls *Lying*. He should have been very much afraid to accuse us of *Lying*, if he is resolved altogether to *represent*, and not to *dispute* : For certainly no wise man will give his Neighbour the lye, unless he be well prepared to prove it against him. *Misrepresenting*

senting was a civil term, because honest men may through mistake *misrepresent* ; but Lying is the fault of Knaves, which as it deserves great punishment, so it ought not to be charged upon men without great proof, much less with none at all : And therefore he should not have taken up an obstinate humour against Disputing, just before he thought fit to charge us with Lying, but have remembred what M. de Meaux says in his Pastoral Letter, p. 29. *Those who bear false and scandalous witness against an innocent person, are condemned to the same punishment which the Crime of which they bear witness did deserve had it been found true.*

But to clear my self as well as I can ; besides this, that I am not conscious to my self of any *misrepresenting* , I must tell him once more , that in a strict and proper sence , to *misrepresent* relates only to matter of fact ; when we charge men with saying and doing what they never said or did , as our *Accommodater* confesses ; and in this sence I have already proved , that we are no *Misrepresenters*, and at last, if I understand him, he confesses that we are not ; but then he tells us, that to *misrepresent*, in a larger and less-proper sence , signifies also to put a false construction on things : As for instance , to say that to Worship Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, as practised by the Church of *Rome*, is to give the Worship of God to Creatures ; and that their Image-Worship is what God has forbid in the second Commandment ; that their denying the Cup to the Laity is contrary to the institution of our Saviour, and their Latine Service is a very unreasonable Worship, and destructive of the edification of the Church, &c. Now though we do not charge them falsely in these cases as to matter of fact, for they do Worship Saints and Images , and deny the Cup to the Laity, and keep the Service of the Church in a Language unknown.

unknown to the people, yet if through prejudice and neglect of due consideration, we should condemn these Practices as contrary to the Laws of God, and injurious to mens Souls, though they were not so. I grant even this may be called Misrepresenting, for 'tis to call good evil, and evil good, light darkness, and darkness light; and whoever is guilty of this kind of Misrepresentation, is guilty of a very great Sin, and does great mischief in the World, not by falsifying matters of Fact, but as much as in him lies, by changing the nature of things.

And upon these terms the dispute of Misrepresenting may be easily accommodated: Let him plainly confess, that we are not Misrepresenters in the first sense; that we do not falsly charge any Doctrines or Practices on the Church of *Rome*, which she disowns; that we do not teach our People, that the Church of *Rome* believes or practices, otherwise than she does, and we will give him leave to call us Misrepresenters still, if he can shew that we charge their Doctrines or Practices with such guilt as they do not deserve.

But it is by no means a sufficient answer to this Charge to call us *Lyars*, which for ought I can see, is all we are like to get in Answer from this man. Of all the several projects for ending Controversie, the most effectual that I ever yet heard of, is that which our Author hath set on foot: For he would now insinuate, that he has vindicated the Church of *Rome* from our Misrepresenting, not one-ly matter of Fact, but the guilt we charge them with upon those matters that are confessed by themselves. Now I have shewn him as well as I could, that some of their confessed Doctrines are false, and some of their confessed Practices are unlawful, and that their best Apologies for them are insufficient. What says the Accomodator to all this? He answers, that all this is *Misrepresenting*, as that signifies
Lying.

Lying. But how the dispute should be carried on upon these Terms, otherwise then by giving him the *Lye* back again, I do not comprehend: And therefore because neither true Religion, or good Breeding, will suffer me to carry on a Dispute at that rate, the Controversie should seem even upon this account to be at end; and I give him joy of the honour that he is like to get by it.

And yet I think an indifferent Reader may observe that his fastning the *Lye* upon us, for Misrepresenting them in the less-proper sense, as he pretends we do, is but an after-game to which he is reduced by the extremity of a bad Cause.

The design of our Author in his Twofold Character of a Papist, was to perswade our People, that we were Misrepresenters in the first and most proper Sense; that we had belyed the Church of *Rome*, with imputing such Doctrines to her, as she did not own; and this all men, that ever I met with, understood to be the design of it: But since he cannot make good his Charge against us, he will now make good his Title of Misrepresenting in a less-proper Sense, not that we misreport the Doctrines and Practices of their Church, but that we unjustly condemn them; and though we will rather allow him to call this Misrepresenting, than dispute about a word, yet if this be all he intended to acquaint the World, that Protestants think worse of Popery, than Papists do, it was a wonderful discovery; and he took as notable a way to rectifie such mis-apprehensions. He disclaims all disputing, and thinks to confute Protestant Misrepresentations, by giving onely a true Character of a Papist, with reference to his Faith and Practice, out of the most authentick Records of their Church: Now if the Misrepresentation does not concern matter of Fact, but only mens judgments and opinions about such matters, how can a
meer

meer Character rectify such Misrepresentations? When we know, what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* is, and yet think very ill of it; Can the meer relating what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome* is, cure our ill opinion of it? And yet this is all the business of a Character to tell us, what a Papist is, which might indeed reconcile us to Popery, had we disliked Popery onely because we did not understand it, or took it to be something more formidable than it is, but cannot cure such dislikes as arise from a true understanding of Popery.

He appeals to the Definitions of the Councils of *Trent*, and the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition, &c. to vindicate Popery from the Misrepresentations of Protestants; that is, to show us what the genuine Doctrines of Popery are: And how can this confute our Misrepresentations, unless by Misrepresenting he understood Misrepresenting matter of Fact; charging such Doctrines on their Church as were never decreed by their Councils, nor owned by their most authentick Expositors? For the Authority of the Council of *Trent* is nothing to us, any otherwise than as we own it to be the Rule and Standard of the Romish Faith; and therefore he can prove nothing against us out of the Council of *Trent*, but onely that those are not the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which we say are, and this cannot confute Protestant Misrepresentations of Popery, unless our Misrepresentations consist in charging them with such Doctrines as their Church and Councils do not own.

And therefore, though he is now willing to grant, that we are not Misrepresenters, as that signifies, *down-right* *Lyers*, who charge the Church of *Rome* with Believing and Practising what she does not, yet it is apparent, that this was what he intended in his Title of a Papist Misre-
pre-

presented, to accuse Protestants of charging Papists with such Doctrines and Practices as they do not own ; and if this be not the intent and design of his Book , there is a great deal less Sense in it, then I thought there had been.

For if by Misrepresenting he only meant , that we reproach and calumniate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* , and charge them with such guilt as they do not deserve , not that we charge them falsely with such Doctrines and Practices as they do not own, (as he now would have it ;) though I grant this may be called Misrepresenting, if the charge be false, yet it is not such a Misrepresenting as is confuted only by a Character, or by true Representing ; it is wholly matter of Dispute, as I have often told him ; for he must not think that we Protestants shall believe ever the better of Popery, because he professes to believe very well of it, in his Character of a Papist Represented.

If he will vindicate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* from that guilt, which Protestants charge on it ; if he will justify the Worship of Saints and Angels and Images, Transubstantiation , the Adoration of the Host, half Communion, Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, &c. and prove us to be Misrepresenters, he must quit his retreat of Character-making , and fairly dispute the points in question, which is the way the generous Advocates of the Church of *Rome* have always taken, to defend her , by the Authority of Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, and here we are ready to joyn issue with them.

And thus , for ought I see , this Controversie is at an end , though he had not charged us with Lying ; for whatever he at first pretended, he grants now, that we are not in a strict and proper sense Misrepresenters ; and thus farewell to Character-making, since Papists and Protestants , who understand these matters are in the
main

main agreed, what the Character of a Papist is, though they differ in their opinions about him, which can never be decided by Characters, but by Reason and Argument. And yet our Author, after all his pretences to an Amicable Accommodation, is unwilling the matter should end thus, at least unless we will acknowledge our selves very much beholden to his good nature for it: Why, what is the matter now? Have I not plainly proved, that we are not Misrepresenters in the strict and proper notion of Misrepresenting? That we do not charge the Church of *Rome* with any matter of Fact, with any Doctrines or Practices which she does not own? And can we Misrepresent them, when we charge them with nothing that is false; Yes, he says, *my principle*, P. 7. *that there can be no Misrepresenting, where there is an agreement in matter of fact, has more of the counterfeit in it than true standard; is supposed to be certain, but without the support of Authority or Reason:* That is, though we charge the Church of *Rome* with nothing but what she her self owns; though we represent a Papist just as a Papist represents himself, as to his Faith and Practice, yet we may be Misrepresenters; and then we may indeed be Misrepresenters for ought I know, if we may Misrepresent, when we say nothing but what is true.

If he can make good this, I must acknowledge him to be a man of Art; and therefore shall briefly examine how he proves it.

He says, *Misrepresenting seems to stand in opposition to Representing, and proper Representing being nothing more, than the describing or shewing a thing, as it is in its self, as many ways, as a thing can be shewn otherwise than it is in its self, so many ways may it be properly Misrepresented.*

C

This

This I agree to, and therefore let us proceed : *Now* (says he) *it is certain, that for the description to bear an exact resemblance with the thing, it must not only agree with it in matter of fact, but likewise in every other respect, which it pretends to declare, as in motive, circumstance, intention, end, &c. The agreement in any one of these being enough to quite change the nature of the thing, notwithstanding the matter of fact being still the same.* And this also I agree in, that motives, circumstances, intention, end, are all to be considered in representing ; but I want a reason, why he distinguishes these from the matter of fact : for by matter of fact, I understand an action clothed with all its circumstances, without which, it is impossible truly to represent any action : For circumstances alter the nature of actions ; As suppose a man be killed, this may be done by accident, or with design, in heat of blood, or of premeditated malice, which makes it, either Chance-medley, Man-slaughter, or Murder ; and therefore the consideration of these things falls under the matter of fact, and are the proper matters for a Jury to inquire into, who yet are judges only of Fact. And thus I understood matter of Fact, when I asserted, that we did not Misrepresent the Church of Rome in any matter of Fact ; that we did not only charge them with nothing but what they did, but that we truly Represented all the circumstances of what they did, as far as the moral nature of the action is concerned in it, and indeed I know not, how we can either Represent or Misrepresent any action without its circumstances ; we may tell what is done, but the matter of the action is the least thing considerable in Representing, because it may be either good or bad in most cases, according to its different circumstances :

stances: and we cannot say, which it is, without considering all circumstances. As for instance, We do not onely charge the Church of *Rome* with Praying to Saints, and Worshipping Images, but we consider what is the Doctrine of their Church about these matters, in what manner they do it, and with what circumstances; we admit of all the excuses and apologies, and fair representations that they can make of it, and then consider what the nature of the action is, and what the Scriptures and Primitive Fathers declare it to be.

This, he knows, I did in the Book, which he now pretends to answer. To put an end to this Dispute about Misrepresenting, I told him, we did not like Popery, as he and the Bishop of *Condom* had Represented it, and shewed him our Reasons why we did not like it, as to the Object of Religious Worship, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images: And had he thought fit to have considered these, we might have obliged him so far, as to have confined the Dispute to his own Characters, and the Bishops Exposition, in the other points of Popery; but he says not one word about this, but advances a new Paradox, that men may be Misrepresenters, though they do not Misrepresent any matter of Fact, because they may Misrepresent the Motives, Circumstances, Intention and End, as if this were not to Misrepresent matter of Fact? Or as if we had Misrepresented them in this manner, when he has not, and cannot give any one instance wherein we have done so?

This short account shews, how impertinent all his examples of Misrepresenters are, who, as he says, did Misrepresent without belying men in matter of Fact;

for though this is nothing to us, unless he could prove us to be such Misrepresenters, which he has not ^{once} attempted to do; yet the Examples he produces do not prove what he brings them for, for all their Misrepresentations are in matters of fact.

L

22 Josh.

Thus the ten Tribes suspected, that the Children of *Reuben* and *Gad*, and the half Tribe of *Manasseh*, had built an Altar for Sacrifice in the borders of *Jordan*, over-against the Land of *Canaan*, whereas the true matter of Fact was, that they had built an Altar not for Sacrifice, but as a witness and memorial of their right to Gods Altar, to offer their Sacrifices and burnt Offerings in the place which God should choose.

1 Sam. I. 13.

When *Eli* thought *Hannah* had been drunken, because she prayed in her heart, only her lips moving, this was Misrepresenting matter of fact, for she was not drunk. And surely he will grant, that the two wanton Elders did foully bely *Susannah*, though she was alone and naked in the Garden, and that they represented the fact, quite otherwise than it was.

And methinks our Author should grant, that the Jews did misrepresent matter of fact, when they charged our Saviour with being a Sabbath-breaker, a Glutton, a Friend of Publicans and Sinners, unless he will say that our Saviour was all this; for if he were not, then they did bely him in matter of fact; and so they did the Apostles and Primitive Christians, when they accused them as Troublers of the City, and Movers of Sedition, that they murdered Infants, and eat their Flesh; that they Worshipped the Sun, and adored an Asses head for God; for I suppose he will grant, that the matter of fact was false.

But still, says the Accommodater, they had some matter

ter of fact, whereon their Accusations were grounded, and which gave some colour and pretence to them. Sometimes they had, and sometimes they had not: But is not this a pleasant inference, that because those who tell onely a piece of a story may misrepresent, therefore those who faithfully relate the whole matter of fact, with all the particular circumstances of it, may be Misrepresenters also? If he can give any one example of this nature, I will onely desire him to tell me the difference between Misrepresenting and true Representing. Men who have wit and malice enough, may put very spiteful constructions upon the most innocent and virtuous Actions, by altering or concealing some circumstances, or the end and intention of doing them; but his is to misrepresent the fact, to represent a thing on otherwise, or for another end, than really it was; but if a man who tells the whole truth, not onely what was done, but the end why, and the manner how it was done, can be a Misrepresenter, the honestest man in the world may be a Misrepresenter.

When an action is truly and fairly Represented, men may still pass a false judgment upon that action; may think that evil and forbidden by God, which God has not forbid, or that allowed and approved by God, which God abhors; but this is not properly Misrepresenting, but judging falsely, which differ just as matter of Fact and matter of Law do in Civil Affairs. In all Causes Criminal and Civil, there are two distinct questions; what the Fact, and what the Law is, what is done, and what judgment the Law passes on such Actions: To falsifie in matters of fact, is to Misrepresent the person and the action; to give a wrong judgment, is to Misrepresent the Law: and thus it is in our case: We are first to enquire,

quire, what the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome are, and then of what nature they are, whether true or false, good or evil: If we affix such Doctrines or Practices on them, as they do not teach, or alter any material circumstance relating to them, then we are Misrepresenters in a proper sense, as misreporting matter of fact; and this we utterly deny, and they can never prove that we do thus misrepresent them, that as our Author misrepresents us, *we usher in, with they teach this, they believe that, they say this, they affirm that, and under these preambles charge the Papists for asserting and believing such Blasphemies, which they would sooner lose their lives than assent to:* Which he has boldly affirmed without giving one instance of it; but as for judging of their Doctrines and Practices, we do indeed pass such a judgment on them, as I doubt not but they will call Misrepresenting; but whether it be so or no, is matter of Dispute, and must be decided by appealing to Scripture and Reason; and we are not ashamed of being called Misrepresenters by them, when that signifies no more, than censuring and condemning their Faith and Practice.

But he has one example more of this Misrepresenting, and that as he thinks a very nicking one, and that is the Fanatical Misrepresentations of the Church of England: To this end he brings in a Dissenter charging the Church of England with Popery, and several other ill things, which is intended to serve more purposes than one.

Had he first proved us to be Misrepresenters, it had been a very proper way to make us sensible of the evil of it, to appeal to our own resentments of such usage. But what if Dissenters Misrepresent the Church of England, does this prove that the Church of England Mis-

repre-

represents the Church of *Rome* ? If we indeed Misrepresent the Church of *Rome*, we have less reason to complain that the Dissenters Misrepresent us ; but if we are no Misrepresenters , we have reason doubly to complain, both for being charged with Misrepresenting, and for being Misrepresented.

And therefore the Answer to this long harangue, is very short and plain ; however the Church of *England* be Misrepresented , whether by Papists or Fanaticks, we justify our selves either by denying matter of Fact when that is false , or by confuting the Charge : We are not afraid of Disputing with our Adversaries when that is needful , but justify the Doctrines and Practices of our Church by Scripture and Reason, which is a more generous way, than meerey to complain of being Misrepresented, without daring to right our selves ; which is the case of our late Character-makers. If the World will be moved by their complaints , to believe that they are Misrepresented, all is well, and they have what they desired ; but if you will be so perverse as not to believe that they are Misrepresented, though they tell you they are , and will needs be a disputing the point with them, they have done with you ; for their business is not to Dispute, but to Represent. The difference between us in this matter , is no more but this: We are not afraid of Misrepresentations , because we know we can defend our selves ; whereas they find they cannot defend themselves, and therefore have no other remedy, but to complain of being Misrepresented.

And yet I must confess, this is as artificial a way of saying nothing, as I have met with. Our Accommodator is very sick of this talk of Misrepresenting, and knew not how to get rid of it, but by diverting the

the Dispute ; and therefore though it be nothing to the purpose , instead of proving that we are Misrepresenters , he desires us to consider , how the Dissenters Misrepresent us : but we have considered that enough already , and when there is occasion for it , will do so again ; our business at present is not with Dissenters , but Papists , and we are not for pursuing every new Game , but will keep to our old scent.

It would be a pleasant Scene , could he at this time of day , engage the Church of *England* and Dissenters in a new Quarrel ; but thanks be to God many of our Dissenters are grown wiser now , and I hope more will every day ; whatever they have formerly suspected of our inclinations to Popery , they find now that they were mistaken in us ; and whatever defects they may chatge our Worship with , I believe they will call it Popish and Antichristian no longer ; to be sure they will never think us the more inclined to Popery , because a Papist says so. While these Gentlemen lay behind the Curtain , and acted the part of a *Zealous Brother* under several disguises , there was much more danger of them than now : They have laid aside their Vizards , and let them now paint the Church of *England* how they please , and the worse the better ; for how mean an opinion soever he seems to have of our Dissenters , they are too wise and cautious to take Characters from open and professed Enemies.

The

The truth is, he has horrible notions of Dissenters, unless by Dissenters he means his dear beloved *Quakers*, with whom *Clark* he is well acquainted, as if he had been either their Master, or Scholar. For he has drawn up such a charge against the Church of *England*, in the name of a Dissenter, as no Dissenter ever made. It is a *Popish* Character, Fathered upon a Dissenter. For what they are much beholden to him, that when he has a mind to say things so foolish and silly, that he himself (who none of the modestest men) is ashamed to own, he can think of no person so fit to say them as a Dissenter.

Did ever any Dissenter charge the Church of *England* with making gods of dead men, because we call our Churches still by the names of those Saints to whom they were dedicated in the times of Popery? For did not the Dissenters themselves do so in the late times of Reformation? And do they scruple to do so now? If there were any difference, it was only in not giving the Title of Saint to them, and I suppose that does not alter the case, for it is to be *Paul's*, or *Peter's*, or *Mary's* Church, it is much the same: But they were not so silly as to think that names which were used only for distinction, without paying any worship to Saints, or entering any Affairs to them, in those Churches which were called by their names, made Gods of dead men. The Bills of Mortality were the same formerly in the Dissenters time, that they are now, and yet they did not suspect themselves guilty of placing *Mary* above *Christ*, or making a Goddess of her.

D

Did

Did ever any Dissenter charge the Church of *England* with Image-Idolatry, for having Pictures in their *Bibles*, or *Moses* and *Aaron* painted with the Ten Commandments, without leaving out the Second against Image-worship? especially when these are things wherein the Church of *England* is no otherwise concerned, than in not correcting the extravagancy of Painters and Printers. And I confess, I have always suspected, that these men, who now charge us with the Image-Idolatry, of having Pictures in our Common-prayer Books (which is a very late invention) did secretly lay the design to reconcile our people by degrees to the use of Pictures and Images.

The Dissenters indeed were never any great Friends to Holy-days; but they never charged us with worshipping Saints on those days, which they saw we did not; nor do they now charge us with worshipping the Bread, when we kneel at receiving the Sacrament, (which is contrary to the publick Declarations of our Church) but reject it, because it was no Table-posture, and because it had been abused (as they scruple not to say) to an Idolatrous worship of the Host in the Church of *Rome*.

They have indeed objected against our Liturgy, That it was taken out of the *Mais-book*, and have been sufficiently answered as to that point; and we know who they were that first started that Objection, some *Mais-Priests* under the disguise of Puritans. But I never heard before, that they were scared with the very names of *Epistles* and *Gospels*, and *Collects*, and *Litanies*, nor did they ever quarrel with retaining *Popish Saints* in our Calendar, when

See Foxes
and Fire-
brands.

when we give them no place in our Prayers, which is only an evidence what Reformation we have made. I never knew before, that our Dissenters thought the Mass-book as Ancient as *St. Basil* and *St. Chrysostom*, or that they liked our Common-Prayer-Book ever the worse, because it came in with the Reformation of Religion, and has been altered since several times for the better; whereas their complaint is, that it is not yet altered enough. Much less are they scandalized at the Thanksgiving for discovery of the Plot, how great a Chimera soever it be.

Nor is there any dispute, that I know of, between the Dissenters and us about the Power of Absolution, or the Ministerial power of forgiving Sin. They and we agree, that Christ has left such a Power in the Church, of remitting and retaining Sins, of receiving in, and putting out of the Church, which is the state of Pardon and Forgiveness; and we both deny, that this is absolute and judicial, or not only Ministerial. They know we oppose the pretence of a Judicial Power to forgive Sins in the Church of *Rome*, which we say is reserved for the great Judge of the World; and it is very strange, they should peremptorily charge us with giving the Power of God to forgive Sins, to men, and yet at the same time accuse us of not agreeing what this power of Absolution is. Tho our Accommodator may make bold sometimes to contradict himself, yet I doubt the Dissenters will think themselves misrepresented by such contradictions.

But did ever any Dissenter charge us with encouraging a Death-bed Repentance, for not obliging

men to Confession and Penance (which he calls to *Confess and Repent*) in the time of their Health ? We teach men to confess their Sins to God, and to men too when there is occasion for it, either to reconcile themselves to their Brother, or to receive Ghostly comfort and advice ; and we teach them to Repent of their Sins, and reform them in time of Health, and show them what great danger there is in a Death-bed Repentance, and how very seldom it proves true ; which is no great encouragement to such delays. But how the Dissenters, who reject Confession to a Priest, and the Popish Sacrament of Penance, themselves, should quarrel with us for doing so, is somewhat strange.

P. 25. But we pretend to a power of giving Absolution, and never enjoin it but in the last agony, which (he says) is argument enough to conclude, there's no obligation of Repenting amongst us, till death looks us in the face. But he has not improved this Argument so well as he might ; for Absolution is never enjoined, not so much as in the hour of Death ; (for we are only required to give Absolution, in case the Penitent earnestly desire it) and therefore, according to his reasoning, it follows, that we think Repentance never necessary, not so much as in the hour of Death. But other men, who have common understanding, would hence conclude, that we make a great difference between the Sinners Repentance, and the Priests Absolution ; that the first is always necessary, the other only in case of Church Censures, or to give relief to afflicted Consciences, or to dismiss penitent sinners in the peace of the Church.

Do

Do not Dissenters themselves allow converted Priests, who are under the vow of Continency, to Marry, if they cannot preserve their Chastity without it? And has not our Accomodator then, put a wise Objection into their Mouths against the Church of *England*; which, if it be any Objection, returns upon themselves? Neither they nor we pretend to dispence with Vows made to God; but we think no Vow can oblige men to Sin; and since all men have not the gift of Continency, as our Saviour says, If such Persons are ensnared in a rash Vow, (it may be, while they were Children, or before they understood their own Temper and Complexion) since we cannot think the Fornication of Priests a more holy State than Marriage, we think it more justifiable to repent of a rash Vow, than to live in a constant state of Temptation and Sin.

It is likely enough, as he says, that Dissenters may complain of Persecution, tho they themselves have been declared Enemies to an unlimited Toleration; and it will be hard to find a medium between a general Liberty of Conscience, and those restraints which are laid on Dissenters.

But it must be considered, whether the Church or the State be chargeable with this. The several Laws which have been made against Dissenters, have been more for the security of the State, than of the Church; have been occasioned by a restless humour which has threatned the publick Peace; and have been rarely executed but at the instance of Civil Authority, to provide for the security of the State; and I suppose he will not parallel this with some other Persecutions. But to make the
Dissenters

Dissenters quarrel at the Assistance given to the *Low-Countries*, and proffered to the *French* in their Rebellion, and the hard usage of the *Queen of Scots*, and the late Murder of *Charles I.* argues, he matters not much what he says; and to charge these Intrigues of State upon the Church of *England*, is to forget that he is in *England* (and not at *Rome*) where Kings make Peace and War, not the Pope with his Council of Cardinals.

And yet our Accommodator has kept the sweetest bit for the last. For he brings in the Dissenter accusing the Church of *England*, for giving every man a liberty of Judging, and yet requiring Obedience to her own Constitutions, which the meanest Sectaries among them challenge and practice; and it is not very modestly done of them, to blame that in us, which they do themselves. They all judg for themselves, and therefore form Churches and Communion of their own; and they will not receive any into their Communion, without owning their Faith, and submitting to their Order and Discipline; and this is all that the Church of *England* challenges, only with this difference, that being established by Law, her Communion and Government is enforced by Laws. And what a mighty Absurdity and Contradiction is this, that men should be taught to use their own Reason and Judgment in Religion, and yet required to submit and conform to a Church, whose Faith and Worship is consonant both to Scripture and Reason.

Well, but after all this Liberty granted by the Church of *England*, *Whosoever will follow her, must shut his Eyes, stifle his Reason, and be led only by*
the

the Nose. Why! What's the matter now? The charge is no more but this, That in matters of Order and Decency; and such things as are left to the Determination of Church Governours, as are neither forbid nor commanded by God, we must submit to the Determinations of Authority, whatever private Judgement or Opinion we may have of things. A great fault this, that tho every man must judge for himself in good and evil, yet every private mans Judgement must be over-ruled by the publick Judgment in matters of Order and external circumstances of Religion.

Much of the same nature, is his concluding P. 31. Charge, *That we are a wavering and unsettled Church, subject to continual Variations*, because some Rites and Ceremonies formerly used, are now laid aside; And what then? Does the settlement of the Church consist in external Ceremonies? Is it any fault in a Church, which challenges to her self a Power to appoint, and constitute, and alter external Rites, to exercise this Power as She shall think most for the Edification of the Church, which is the only Rule of right and wrong in this Case, which may therefore change with the Change and Alteration of times and Persons, and other external circumstances of Affairs?

Now let every man judg, whether there were ever such a Speech made for a Dissenter before, which in every Point of it is directly contrary to his own Profession and Practice: It is time for our Author to have done with his Trade of Representing, for no man would know what it was he Represented, did he not take care with the unskilful Painter to

write

wrote over his unclean Figures, what they are; This is no Horse, and this an Ass. And thus this heinous design of Representing and Misrepresenting, ends only in ridiculing the Church of England; & Liberty, which if we needed it, is not mannerly for us to sit at our ease; but we are contented they should ridicule our Church, if they will permit us truly to Represent theirs.

P. 35. But to proceed, Our Accommodator grants that he is still in Arrears; and certainly, never any Bankrupt paid less in the Pound than he offers; and this is his Accommodating, which Merchants call Compounding.

In my Answer to his *Reflections*, I proved, that what he calls the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, has nothing of Misrepresentation in it properly so called; for there was no matter of Fact misrepresented; in his Answer, which he calls, *Papists protesting against Protestant Popery*, instead of justifying his Character, he seeks out for new Misrepresentations; thus in my last Answer, I enquired the reason of *Why, instead of justifying his own Misrepresentations, which he had so unjustly fathered upon us, he should hunt about to pick up some new Misrepresentations for me to Answer*. And the Reason he now assigns for it, is, *Because I had little to say against the former, except that they were not to be called Misrepresentations in a strict Sense*. Now, the less I had to say, it was the more easily answered, tho I know not what more need to be answered to the charge of Misrepresenting, than to prove that it is false. But he says, *he fathered his Misrepresentations on no Body*; and so much the worse for that, for a general charge includes every Body. And

And yet he was as unfortunate in his new Misrepresentations, as in his old ones. He brings in the Arch-Bishop of York for a Misrepresenter, whereas the Misrepresentations he Transcribes out of the Arch-Bishop, the Arch-Bishop cites out of Popish Authors, and names the Authors where they are to be found; but the Protester to make a Misrepresenter of him, conceals all these Authorities, and sets down the Words as the Bishops own; and this he did only *to consult the Credit of the Prelate*: In what P. 36.
 Sir? That he might have the entire Glory of being a Misrepresenter, without being thought to steal out of Popish Authors.

But he saies, The Bishop is still a Misrepresenter, in charging these sayings of private Doctors upon the Church; But where does he do that? Yes, He saies, *He (that is, the Papist) must believe*; but does he say, The Church says thus, or only Stapleton? Stapleton might be a Misrepresenter, in delivering this as the Faith of the Church, *That we must simply believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false*; but the Arch-Bishop does not Misrepresent the Church in saying, that Stapleton saies so. What is the Authority of private Doctors, is not the Dispute; but, whether Protestants be Misrepresenters for saying, That such Doctrines are taught by such Doctors of the Church of Rome.

The Case of Mr. Sutcliff (another of his Misrepresenters) is somewhat different. For, besides what he cites from their own Authors, which is set down by the Protester without taking notice that he quotes his Authors for it; he many times charges them with the Consequences of their Doctrines

E

and

and Practices ; not that he charges them with owning such Consequences, but proves such Doctrines on them, from what they do profess and own ; and such sayings as these the Protester sets down as charged on the Church of *Rome* in the first instance, as her avowed Doctrine: When Mr. *Sutcliff* only alledges them, as the just interpretations and Consequences of her Doctrine, which differ just as much as Misrepresenting and Disputing ; as saying what a Church professes to believe , and what the consequence of such a Faith is. As to show this by an instance or two : The Protester sets these Propositions down as Mr. *Sutcliff's* Misrepresentations. *That Papists speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures ; That they give the Office of Christs Mediation to the Virgin Mary, to Angels, and to Saints ; That by the Doctrine of Papists, the Devils in Hell may be saved.* Now indeed, had he said, That the Papists teach this in expresse Words, he had been a Misrepresenter in a proper Sense, for they teach no such thing ; but Mr. *Sutcliff* never charges these Doctrines Directly upon them, but saies, *That they say, the Scriptures are obscure and hard to be understood ; and this is, to speak in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures. That they teach, that by the merits of Saints, Christians obtain their desires, and are delivered out of Purgatory. And this is to give the Office of Christs Mediation to the Virgin Mary, and to Saints. That they teach, that the Devils in Hell may have true Faith ; and yet our Saviour saith, Whosoever believeth in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life : So it follows by the Doctrines of Papists, That the Reprobrates and Devils in Hell may* be

be saved. So that he expressly distinguishes between what the Papists teach, and what himself concludes from such Doctrines, and therefore he does not Misrepresent the Papists; for he charges them with owning no Doctrines but what they do own; but if he be guilty of any fault, it is in reasoning and Disputing; and there is no way that I know of, to confute such Consequences, but by Reason and Dispute; the very Name of which is very uneasy to the Representor, and there is good reason why it should be so.

And this I suppose may satisfy the Accommodator, Why I charged him with setting down these sayings of Mr. *Sutcliff*, seperated from the Reasons of them; for how little soever he may think himself concerned in his Reasons, yet it is of great Consequence in the matter of Representing, to distinguish between the Doctrines of Papists, and what is charged on them, only, as the Consequence of their Doctrines. To charge them with teaching such Doctrines as they do not teach, is Misrepresenting; and therefore, had these sayings, which he Transcribed out of Mr. *Sutcliff*, been charged upon the Papists as their sayings, it had been Misrepresenting; and this was the design of the Protester in quoting these sayings, without giving an account upon what occasion they were said, to persuade his Readers, that Mr. *Sutcliff* had directly and immediately charged these Doctrines upon Papists as expressly taught by them, and then he had been a Misrepresentor indeed. But since it is otherwise, it is plain, Mr. *Sutcliff* was Misrepresented by the Protester, but he did not Misrepresent Papists, as that signifies

charging them immediately with such Doctrines as they do not own.

- P. 37. In the next place he charges me with translating dishonestly, for not rendring *propter Deum*, or for Gods sake, in *English*, in the form of consecrating the Cross. Now I confess, why this was not translated I cannot tell, and knew nothing of it, till I was informed by him; had it been in a dispute about the nature and reason of that worship which they pay to the Cross, these words had been very considerable; but it relating only to the manner of consecrating the Cross, they signified nothing, as any one will see, who consults the place. Especially considering, that the whole design of that Discourse about the Worship of Images (against which he has not one word to object, but this Omission) was to show the evil of Image-worship, tho they gave no Worship to the material Image, but only worshipped God or Christ, or the Saints by Images; and therefore I had no occasion at all to conceal the *English* of *propter Deum*.

- P. 38. In my Answer to *Papists protesting against Protestant-Popery*, I took occasion to examine the Bishop of Condom's Exposition in two very concerning Points, viz. *The Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images*; our Accomodator, it seems, could see no reason why he should engage in this Dispute, and therefore thinks it sufficient to show, that my Reasons for this Dispute are not cogent, and he names two, such as they are; 1. That *I know no reason for all this Dispute*. But this saying related to the Dispute about the Bishop of Condom's Authority, not about his Exposition of the Catholick Faith.

2. His

2. His second Reason is like the first; I *cause* I said, He was not satisfied with my bare telling *in*, That I was not satisfied with his Religion; and therefore now I would give him my Reasons for it; which he huffs at, and says, he was never concerned with *my* not liking his Religion. What pretty Reasons will serve to excuse a Man from Answering a Discourse which he knows he cannot answer!

The plain case is this, The Representor made his Appeals, and put great confidence in the Bishop of *Condom's* Authority, whose business is to put the softest sense he can upon the Doctrines of the Council of *Trent*; and such Interpretations of the Catholick Faith, as have been condemned by other very Catholick Doctors. In my Reply to the *Reflections*, I considered what this Bishops Authority is; and in my last Answer I examined what the Protester had returned in the defence of it, which our Accommodator now says not one word to: But let I told him, I knew no reason for this dispute, Whether the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition were to be the standard of the *Roman* Catholick Faith; for if we should allow this, yet Popery is a very corrupt Religion, tho the Bishop of *Condom* were the Authentick Expositor of it. And to show that it is so, I undertook to examine that Bishops Exposition in those two great Articles of the *Romish* Faith, the Invocation of *Saints*, and Worship of *Images*; and how this should be a Reason for our Accommodator to take no notice of it, I cannot imagine: Had he any zeal for his Religion, and could have answered that Discourse, I believe all that I could have said would not have hindred him.

To

To conclude this whole matter, He peremptorily adheres to his first Title of a *Representer*, and declines all manner of disputation, tho in vindication of the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition, to which he so often Appeals. The only point he sticks to is, That to assent to the *Catholick Faith*, as expounded in his Character, and by the Bishop of *Condom*, is sufficient for any Man to be received into the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. But both he and the Bishop of *Condom* do not meerly Represent, but Reason and Argue also; and I should have thought they had been a little concerned to justify their own Representations and Reasonings. But whether this Reasoning and Disputing were agreeable to his design or not, it was very necessary to ours. For when they endeavour to soften the Doctrines of their Church, and to abate a great deal of *Bellarmin's* Popery; to reconcile our people to them; it is necessary for us to warn them of the snare, and to show them what an ill thing Popery is in its best dress; and therefore I was little desirous that he should answer what I have said to this purpose, as he cares for doing it: I never writ a Book with a desire to have it answered; but to inform those, who otherwise might be imposed on. And I suppose our people will think never the worse of any Book, because *Papists* decline the dispute, who were never known to avoid Disputing, when they thought they could get any thing by it.

And thus I take a fair leave of the *Representer*; for this matter, I think, is driven as far as it will go: We have by his own confession, cleared ourselves from being *Misrepresenters* in the true and proper sense of the Word; for we have not falsely charged

charged them with any Doctrines and Practices disowned by their Church; and as for their *Character of a Papist Represented*, tho' it falls very short of what some great Divines among them, of equal Authority with the Bishop of *Condom*, have thought to be the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; yet we are willing to joyn issue with them upon their own terms, and to shew them our Reasons, why we cannot comply with this refined and new-modelled Popery. But this is to dispute, and that does not agree with a *Representer*, whose business is to make *Characters* without any concern to defend the : And I am not so fond of disputing, as to dispute with him whether he will or no.

F I N I S.